

REMARKS

We are in receipt of the Office Action dated September 5, 2003, and the above amendment and following remarks are made in light thereof.

Claims 20-26, 28-50, 52 and 53 are pending in the application. Pursuant to the Office Action, claim 49 stands rejected under 35 USC 112 for indefiniteness due to the inclusion of the word "type". By way of the foregoing amendment, the word "type" has been deleted from claim 49. Each of claims 20-26, 28-50, 52 and 53 stands rejected for obviousness over various combinations of Arai et al. 5,817,366, Grothe et al. 3,931,490, Monk 4,187,801, Mizutani et al. 6,326,726, Bennett 2,435,997, 2,435,997, Feuerstein et al. 4,627,989, and Spitzer et al. 5,258,325. (the latter reference being applied only against claim 49). See paragraphs 9, 20, 34, 40, 50, 56, 66, 73, 82, 87 and 96 of the Office Action.

The rejection of claims 20-22, 44, 45 and 48 is set forth in paragraph 9 of the Office Action. These claims stand rejected over a combination of Arai et al., Grothe et al. and Monk. However, Arai et al. do not suggest a display (EL cell) which does not have a pixel thin film transistor. Grothe et al. discloses the use of an electron beam evaporator. An electron gun emits an X-ray. By this X-ray, a characteristic of a thin film transistor is changed to lose control of the characteristic of the thin film transistor. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would use an electron beam evaporator for a display which does not have a pixel thin film transistor. Because Arai et al. do not suggest a display (EL cell) which does not have a pixel thin film transistor, one of ordinary skill in the art would not use the electron beam evaporator of Grothe et al. for the EL cell of Arai et al. Monk describes a method and apparatus for transporting work pieces. However, Monk does not suggest a display which does not have a pixel thin film transistor.

The rejection of claims 23, 25, 29, 33, 34, 43, 46, 47, 50 and 52 is set forth in paragraph 20 of the Office Action. In response, claims 23, 25, 29, 33, 34, 46, 47, 50 and 52 are canceled in the present amendment. Claim 43 is amended, as set forth above.

Paragraph 34 of the Office Action sets forth the rejection of claims 24, 30, 43, 46 and 47. In response, claims 24, 30, 46 and 47 are canceled, and claim 43 is amended.

Paragraph 40 of the Office Action sets forth the rejection of claims 26, 31, 35, 43, 46, 47 and 52. In response, claims 26, 31, 35, 46, 47 and 52 are canceled, and claim 43 is amended.

Paragraph 50 of the Office Action sets forth the rejection of claims 28, 32, 36, 43, 46 and 47. In response, claims 28, 32, 36, 46 and 47 are canceled, and claim 43 is amended.

Paragraph 56 set forth a rejection of claims 37, 43, 48, and 53 over Arai et al., Bennett and Grothe et al. Applicant's arguments as to Arai et al. and Grothe et al. are set forth above, and are equally applicable here. In addition, Bennett describes an apparatus for vapor coating of large surfaces. However, Bennett does not suggest a display which does not have a pixel thin film transistor.

Paragraph 66 sets forth the rejection of claims 38, 43, 48 and 53 over Arai et al., Bennett, Grothe et al. and Monk. The arguments set forth above with respect to Arai et al., Grothe et al., Bennett and Monk are equally applicable here.

Paragraph 73 sets forth the rejection of claims 39, 43, 48 and 53 over Arai et al., Feuerstein et al. and Bennett. In response, claim 39 is amended to call for the additional step of cleaning an inside of the evaporation chamber. None of the references to Arai et al., Feuerstein et al. or Bennett suggest cleaning the inside of the evaporation chamber. Further, claim 39 calls for evaporating a first material and a second material in the same evaporation chamber. Because the same evaporation chamber is used to evaporate both the first material and second material,



two evaporation chambers are not necessary. Thus, the number of evaporation chambers to be cleaned is reduced, which provides an advantage for the claimed invention over the prior art.

Paragraph 82 sets forth rejection of claims 40, 43 and 48 over Arai et al., Feuerstein et al. and Bennett, or the same three patents in combination with Monk. In response, claim 40 has been amended require cleaning the inside of the evaporation chamber. As set forth above, Arai et al., Feuerstein et al. and Bennett do not suggest cleaning the inside of the evaporation chamber. The same applies to Monk. The advantages that accrue to the invention of claim 39 are equally applicable to the invention of claim 40.

Paragraph 87 of the Office Action sets forth the rejection of claims 41, 42, 46 and 47. In response, each of these claims is canceled.

Paragraph 97 sets forth the rejection of claim 49. Claim 49 is dependent from claim 20 and is distinguishable over the prior art for the same reasons.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that the application is now in condition for allowance, and an early Office Action in this regard is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 5, 2009

Stephen B. Heller
Stephen B. Heller
Attorney of Record
Registration No.: 30,181
COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500